



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

Andrew Donnelly Concannon, Esq.  
3168 Sundown Lane  
Saginaw, MI 48603

OCT 24 2008

RE: MUR 6004  
Friends of Andrew Concannon  
Andrew Concannon  
"Friends of Andrew Concannon aka  
[sic] Concannon for Congress" (f/k/a  
Concannon for Congress) and  
Raymond Mashni, in his official  
capacity as treasurer

Dear Mr. Concannon:

On May 7, 2008, the Federal Election Commission notified you of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). A copy of the complaint was forwarded to you at that time.

Upon further review of the allegations contained in the complaint, and information supplied by you, the Commission, on October 1, 2008, found that there was no reason to believe that Friends of Andrew Concannon violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 433, 434, 441a, 441b, 441c and 441e, provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. The Commission also found there is no reason to believe that you violated 2 U.S.C. § 441i(e) and 11 C.F.R. § 300.61.

The Commission, on the same date, also voted to dismiss as a matter of prosecutorial discretion and issue an admonishment to "Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress" (f/k/a Concannon for Congress) and Raymond Mashni, in his official capacity as treasurer, ("the Committee"), in connection with violations of 2 U.S.C. §§ 433, 434(b), and 441d, and closed the file in this matter. The Commission admonishes the Committee for apparent violations of: (1) 2 U.S.C. § 433 caused by not timely amending its Statement of Organization to correct the erroneous identification of Friends of Andrew Concannon as an affiliated committee; (2) 2 U.S.C. § 434(b) caused by failing to disclose a \$350 in-kind contribution of digital signs from Dave's Sign Rental; and (3) 2 U.S.C. § 441d caused by improperly identifying "Friends of Andrew of Concannon," an entity not registered as an authorized committee, on campaign communications as the entity paying for the communications. The Factual and Legal Analysis, which more fully explains the Commission's decision, is enclosed for your information.

The Committee should amend the appropriate disclosure report to disclose the in-kind contribution resulting from the donation of digital signs.

28044220698

The Committee's current name, as listed on its May 30, 2008, amendment to its Statement of Organization, is "Friends of Andrew Concannon aka Concannon for Congress," but the Committee appears to be using Concannon for Congress and Friends of Andrew Concannon interchangeably. The Committee must use its complete name, as the name appears on its current Statement of Organization, on all required disclaimers for communications paid for by the Committee. The Committee may amend its Statement of Organization to change its name, but it then must use whatever name is listed on its most recent Statement of Organization on all required disclaimers for all communications paid for by the Committee.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. *See* Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003).

If you have any questions, please contact Dominique Dillenseger, the attorney assigned to this matter, at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Audra Wassom", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Audra L. Wassom  
Acting Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure  
Factual and Legal Analysis

28044220699

**FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION**

**FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

**RESPONDENTS:** Andrew Concannon  
Friends of Andrew Concannon  
"Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic]  
Concannon for Congress" (f/k/a Concannon for Congress)  
and Raymond Mashni, in his official capacity as treasurer

**MUR: 6004**

**I. GENERATION OF MATTER**

This matter was generated by a complaint filed with the Federal Election Commission by the Michigan Republican Party. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(1).

**II. FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS**

The complaint in this matter contains three general allegations: (1) Friends of Andrew Concannon ("FAC"), a Section 527 organization, violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, ("the Act") by receiving contributions and making expenditures in connection with a Federal election without registering and reporting as a political committee; (2) that FAC may be raising funds from prohibited sources or accepting excessive contributions, and that Andrew Concannon, the candidate, is raising funds for FAC in violation of 2 U.S.C. § 441i and 11 C.F.R. § 300.61 (funds not subject to the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of the Act); and (3) that Concannon For Congress ("CFC"), Mr. Concannon's principal campaign committee, may have failed to properly disclose all disbursements in connection with a St. Patrick's Day event and may have received prohibited in-kind contributions from FAC in connection with this event.

Finally, while not specifically alleged in the complaint, Respondents improperly listed FAC on CFC's disclosure forms and campaign communications. As discussed further below, the available information indicates that after Mr. Concannon became a Federal candidate, he

1 registered his principal campaign committee under the name "Concannon for Congress" but used  
2 the name "Friends of Andrew Concannon," the name of the Section 527 organization that  
3 engaged in exploratory activities, as if it were an authorized committee of CFC. It appears that  
4 the committee might be using the FAC and CFC names interchangeably.<sup>1</sup>

5       **A.     Alleged Failure to Register FAC as a Political Committee and File FEC**  
6       **Disclosure Reports**

7  
8       The complaint alleges that FAC, a Section 527 entity not registered with the FEC,  
9 received contributions and made expenditures in connection with a Federal election without  
10 registering and reporting as a political committee.

11       In support of its allegations, the complaint provides a copy of Internal Revenue Service  
12 Form 8871 ("Political Organization Notice of Section 527 Status"), which shows that Mr.  
13 Concannon established an entity called "Friends of Andrew Concannon" in late November 2007,  
14 and filed the Notice of Status with the IRS on January 22, 2008.<sup>2</sup> Complaint at Exhibit 1. The  
15 complaint states that FAC is not registered as a political committee with the FEC or with any  
16 other election authority, but points out that the Notice of Section 527 Status contains the  
17 following statement of purpose:

18               "Campaign and fundraising committee/association organized for accepting  
19 donations and making expenditures for the purpose of electing Andrew  
20 Concannon to public office – an exempt function under law."  
21

22   *Id.* at 1.

---

<sup>1</sup> The committee's most recent disclosure report, the 2008 Pre-Primary Report, filed on July 24, 2008, and covering the period April 1, 2008 through July 16, 2008, lists "Concannon for Congress" as the committee name, approximately two months after the committee changed its name on its Statement of Organization to "Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress."

<sup>2</sup> The Form 8871 that FAC filed with the IRS to register as a Section 527 organization indicates that FAC was established on November 29, 2007. However, the Form 8871 was not actually signed by Andrew Concannon until January 22, 2008. The Commission does not know why the Form 8871 was not signed until January 22nd.

28044220701

1 In reply, Respondents assert that they did not violate the Act and the Commission's  
2 regulations, explaining that PAC was the precursor organization to CFC and was formed during  
3 the exploratory phase to determine whether Mr. Concannon's candidacy was viable.  
4 Respondents further assert that Mr. Concannon filed the Notice of Section 527 Status so that  
5 PAC would be tax-exempt during the exploratory period. Respondents assert that PAC only  
6 raised and spent permissible funds during the exploratory period, which were properly disclosed  
7 in CFC's first disclosure report, the 2008 April Quarterly Report.<sup>3</sup>

8 Under the Act, an individual becomes a candidate for Federal office (and thus triggers  
9 registration and reporting obligations under the Act) when his or her campaign either receives  
10 \$5,000 in contributions or makes \$5,000 in expenditures. 2 U.S.C. § 431(2). There is, however,  
11 a limited exception for amounts raised and spent while an individual is "testing the waters" in  
12 order to decide whether to become a candidate. In such cases, the Commission's regulations  
13 provide that the terms "contribution" and "expenditure" do not include funds received or  
14 payments made solely to determine whether an individual should become a candidate. 11 C.F.R.  
15 §§ 100.72(a) and 100.131(a). Thus, before making a final decision as to whether to become a  
16 candidate, an individual may raise or spend more than \$5,000 without triggering candidate status  
17 if his or her activities are permissible "testing the waters" activities, which include, but are not  
18 limited to, conducting polls, making telephone calls, and travel. *Id.* Only funds permissible  
19 under the Act may be used for such activities. *Id.*

20 However, when an individual raises or spends more than \$5,000 and engages in activities  
21 indicating that he or she has decided to run for a particular office, or activities relevant to

---

<sup>3</sup> After its registration as a principal campaign committee, CFC filed its first disclosure report, the 2008 April Quarterly Report. The report disclosed receipts totaling \$27,866.70 and disbursements totaling \$11,643.14, including itemized receipts of \$3,447.64 and disbursements of \$1,773.64 during the exploratory period.

28044220702

conducting a campaign, the individual is deemed to have crossed the line from "testing the waters" to "candidate" status under the Act. These activities include, but are not limited to: using general public political advertising to publicize the individual's intention to campaign for Federal office; raising funds in excess of what could reasonably be expected to be used for exploratory activities or activities designed to amass funds to be spent after becoming a candidate; making or authorizing written or oral statements that refer to the individual as a candidate for a particular office; or conducting activities in close proximity to the election or over a protracted period of time. 11 C.F.R. §§ 100.72(b) and 100.131(b).

Based on the information provided by Respondents and in disclosure reports, it appears that Concannon established FAC as his "exploratory committee" while testing the waters to determine the viability of his candidacy. First, the name "Friends of Andrew Concannon" does not refer to Concannon as a candidate for a particular office. Second, the statement of purpose on the Section 527 application is ambiguous regarding whether Concannon had in fact made a decision to run for Federal office. In any event, even if the statement could be construed as a statement of his intent to run for office, the amount of money raised or spent by Mr. Concannon during the exploratory phase was below the \$5,000 threshold for triggering candidate status. See n.3, *supra*.

Therefore, the Commission finds no reason to believe that Friends of Andrew Concannon violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 433 and 434 by failing to register and report as a political committee.

**B. Alleged Impermissible Fundraising By Andrew Concannon for FAC and Fundraising By FAC**

According to the complaint, Andrew Concannon, a candidate for the U.S. House of Representatives for Michigan's 4th Congressional District, raised funds for FAC in amounts and

28044220703

1 from sources prohibited under the Act. Complaint at 2-3. The complaint also alleges that FAC  
2 may have raised funds on its own that do not meet the requirements of the Act.

3 The Act, as amended, prohibits Federal candidates and officeholders, any "agent of a  
4 candidate or an individual holding Federal office," or any entity established, financed,  
5 maintained or controlled by a Federal candidate from soliciting, receiving, directing, transferring  
6 or spending funds in connection with an election for Federal office, including funds for Federal  
7 election activity, or in connection with any election other than an election for Federal office,  
8 unless the funds are subject to the limitations, prohibitions and reporting requirements of the Act.  
9 2 U.S.C. § 441i(e)(1). The available information indicates that FAC and Mr. Concannon raised  
10 funds for Mr. Concannon's Federal campaign within the limits of the Act. Respondents state  
11 that all of the funds raised by and for FAC were disclosed by CFC in its first disclosure report.  
12 Response at 2. The Commission has no information to suggest otherwise, and the contributions  
13 disclosed in CFC's 2008 April Quarterly Report appear to be within applicable limits and from  
14 permissible sources. Therefore, the Commission finds no reason to believe that Andrew  
15 Concannon violated 2 U.S.C. § 441i(e) and 11 C.F.R. § 300.61 in connection with these  
16 activities. For the same reasons, the Commission finds no reason to believe that FAC violated  
17 2 U.S.C. §§ 441a, 441b, 441c, and 441e in connection with these activities.

18 **C. Alleged Nondisclosure of In-kind Contributions and Expenditures for St.**  
19 **Patrick's Day Event**  
20

21 The complaint alleges that the amount CFC disclosed for parade supplies (\$224.87) on its  
22 2008 April Quarterly Report must be far less than what it actually spent, and that FAC, the  
23 unregistered committee, must have paid for the supplies as prohibited in-kind contributions. In  
24 their response, Respondents stated that they reported all expenses for the event and provided  
25 invoices for the expenses, which total \$626.87: T-shirts (\$162.18); printing of signs and banners

28044220704

1 (\$402.00); and candy (\$62.69). All of these expenses were reported on CFC's 2008 April  
2 Quarterly Report. *See* Response at Exhibits A-C. Because, as further discussed below (Section  
3 D), it appears that FAC became CFC and the two are actually one in the same committee, it does  
4 not appear that CFC accepted prohibited in-kind contributions from FAC.

5 Respondents also indicate that two digital signs bearing Mr. Concannon's image were on  
6 display at the St. Patrick's Day event. *Id.* at 2. Respondents assert that the digital signs were  
7 provided by two individuals (owners of the sign business called "Dave's Sign Rental") "as a  
8 voluntary expression of support" and that these individuals "did not intend to make a donation."  
9 Respondents note that they determined the cost of the sign usage and accessories to be \$350 and  
10 that if the Commission considers these signs to be an in-kind contribution, they will amend their  
11 April Quarterly Report to disclose the contribution. Respondents further note that any such  
12 contribution from Dave's Sign Rental would be permissible because Dave's Sign Rental is not  
13 organized as a corporation. A Dun and Bradstreet search does not reveal any information that  
14 would indicate that Dave's Sign Rental is incorporated. Therefore, any contribution from Dave's  
15 Sign Rental to CFC would be permissible within the Act's contribution limits, but would need to  
16 be disclosed by the committee in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 434(b).

17 Respondents note that a truck and trailer were used to haul and position the signs, but did  
18 not specifically state that Dave's Sign Rental paid for or provided the truck and trailer. A photo  
19 of the truck and trailer provided with the complaint shows what appear to be the campaign's own  
20 signs on the truck attached to the trailer with the digital signs provided by Dave's Sign Rental.  
21 *See* Complaint at Exhibit 6. Thus, it appears that the campaign itself may have provided the  
22 truck and trailer to haul the digital signs provided by Dave's Sign Rental, which would indicate

28044220705



1 knowledge by the campaign that the digital signs were going to be provided and participation in  
2 the set-up of the signs with Dave's Sign Rental.

3 A contribution is anything of value given, loaned or advanced to influence a federal  
4 election. *See* 2 U.S.C. § 431(8)(A)(i); *see also* 11 C.F.R. § 100.52(a). Commission regulations  
5 define "anything of value" to include "the provision of any goods or services without charge or  
6 at a charge that is less than the usual and normal charge for such goods or services." 11 C.F.R.  
7 § 100.52(d)(1). Thus, the donation of the digital signs without charge appears to constitute an in-  
8 kind contribution from Dave's Sign Rental to Respondents. An in-kind contribution is treated as  
9 both a "contribution" to and an "expenditure" by the political committee receiving the in-kind  
10 contribution. 11 C.F.R §§ 100.111(e); 104.13(a)(2). An authorized committee of a candidate must  
11 report and itemize all contributions received from individuals that aggregate in excess of \$200 per  
12 election cycle. 2 U.S.C. § 434(b); 11 C.F.R. § 104.3(a)(4). An in-kind contribution must also be  
13 reported as an expenditure on the same report. 11 C.F.R. §§ 104.3(b) and 104.13(a)(2). As such,  
14 \$350.00 should have been disclosed as both a contribution to and an expenditure by Respondents  
15 in their 2008 April Quarterly Report.

16 Based on Respondents' response to the complaint and disclosure reports, it appears that  
17 Respondents properly disclosed all contributions and expenditures associated with the St.  
18 Patrick's Day event, except for the in-kind contribution from Dave's Sign Rental. Thus, it  
19 appears that Respondents violated 2 U.S.C. § 434(b) by failing to disclose an in-kind  
20 contribution. Because the failure to disclose the in-kind contribution was *de minimis*, the  
21 Commission has determined to dismiss with admonishment.

28049220706

**D. Apparent Failure of Respondents to Properly Register the Name of the Principal Campaign Committee and Include the Appropriate Disclaimer on Communications**

The complaint states that the Concannon's campaign Statement of Organization identifies FAC as an "affiliated committee" of CFC, even though FAC is not registered with the FEC, and that various Concannon campaign communications and correspondence contain a statement that FAC paid for the communication. The complaint provides the following documents: (1) a copy of a campaign brochure produced by the Concannon campaign with the statement: "Paid for by Friends of Andrew Concannon"; (2) a page from the official website for Concannon for Congress which states "Powered by Friends of Andrew Concannon"; and, (3) copy of an April 2, 2008, letter from Concannon for Congress to the FEC on stationery containing the statement: "Paid for by Friends of Andrew Concannon." Complaint at Exhibits 1-5.

Achieving "candidate" status triggers registration and reporting requirements for the candidate and for his principal campaign committee. Within 15 days of becoming a candidate, the individual must file a Statement of Candidacy with the Commission that designates the candidate's principal campaign committee. 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(1); *see also* 11 C.F.R. § 101.1(a). The principal campaign committee must file a Statement of Organization no later than ten days after it has been designated by the candidate. 2 U.S.C. § 433(a).

The candidate may designate the exploratory committee as the principal campaign committee and change the name of the committee as appropriate. The candidate may also designate additional political committees to serve as authorized committees of the candidate that may accept contributions or make expenditures on behalf of the candidate by filing a designation with the principal campaign committee. *See* 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(1); 11 C.F.R. §§ 101.1(b) and 102.13(a)(1). However, within 10 days after being designated by the candidate, the authorized

28044220707

1 committee must file its own registration statement (FEC Form 1, Statement of Organization) and  
2 disclosure reports. *See* 2 U.S.C. §§ 433 and 434(b); 11 C.F.R. §§ 102.1(b) and 102.13(a)(1).  
3 Any amendment to the Statement of Organization must be filed within 10 days of the date of the  
4 change or correction. *Id.*

5 On January 23, 2008, Mr. Concannon filed his Statement of Candidacy designating  
6 "Concannon for Congress" as the principal campaign committee and "Friends of Andrew  
7 Concannon" as an "authorized committee." On January 28, 2008, the treasurer for CFC filed a  
8 Statement of Organization (FEC Form 1) registering CFC as the principal campaign committee  
9 and identifying FAC as an "affiliated committee." After receiving notice of the complaint, CFC  
10 filed an amended Statement of Organization on June 2, 2008, deleting the identification of FAC  
11 as an "affiliated committee" and changing the name of the principal campaign committee to  
12 "Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress."

13 In their response, Respondents clarify that FAC was a "precursor committee" to CFC and  
14 that it was identified on CFC's Statement of Organization to disclose its existence and to register  
15 FAC under the name CFC. Response at 2. Respondents further state that FAC and CFC "are  
16 one in the same committee." *Id.* The response did not explain why the campaign has identified  
17 FAC as the entity financing the campaign's communications.

18 As already explained, Mr. Concannon apparently designated FAC as an "authorized  
19 committee" on his Statement of Candidacy and as an "affiliated committee" on CFC's Statement  
20 of Organization merely to disclose the existence of FAC as the precursor organization to CFC  
21 and to register FAC under the name CFC.<sup>4</sup> However, as a designated "authorized committee,"  
22 FAC never filed a Statement of Organization as required under the Act and regulations and did

---

<sup>4</sup> All authorized committees of the same candidate for the same election to Federal office are affiliated. 11 C.F.R. § 100.5(g)(1).

1 not file any disclosure reports. It also appears that Respondents erroneously identified FAC as  
2 an affiliated committee on the Statement of Organization. When Respondents later amended  
3 their Statement Organization to change the committee name to "Friends of Andrew Concannon  
4 aka [sic] Concannon for Congress," they deleted the reference to FAC as an affiliated committee.  
5 However, the amendment deleting the reference to FAC as an affiliated committee was filed  
6 more than 4 months after the original Statement of Organization, in violation of 2 U.S.C. § 433.

7 It also appears that Respondents erroneously listed FAC on campaign communications as  
8 the entity paying for the communications. The response does not address why Respondents did  
9 so, but the available information, including Respondents' use of two names on its amended  
10 Statement of Organization and its continued use of both names on campaign communications,  
11 suggests that Respondents believe that the Committee may use more than one official name.

12 A campaign that authorizes and finances any communication must include a disclaimer  
13 notice, which states that the communication was paid for by the authorized committee.  
14 2 U.S.C. § 441d(a). Communications requiring a disclaimer include those made through any  
15 broadcast, cable, or satellite communication, newspaper, magazine, outdoor advertising facility;  
16 mass mailing (more than 500 substantially similar mailings within 30 days), telephone bank  
17 (more than 500 substantially similar calls within 30 days), or any other form of general public  
18 political advertising. 11 C.F.R. § 100.26, 100.27, 100.28. Electronic mail of more than 500  
19 substantially similar communications when sent by a political committee, and all Internet  
20 websites of political committees available to the general public must also include disclaimers.  
21 11 C.F.R. § 110.11.

22 The CFC identified FAC as the entity paying for the communication in disclaimers on at  
23 least one campaign brochure, a letter sent to the FEC on campaign stationery, and on its official

28044220709

1 campaign website. Complaint at Exhibits 1-5. The Commission does not have information on  
2 how the campaign brochure was disseminated or how the campaign stationery was used, but the  
3 available information suggests that CFC may have used the same disclaimer on all of its  
4 campaign communications. Because FAC was not a registered authorized committee of CFC,  
5 CFC's use of FAC in its disclaimers on a CFC campaign brochure, on the campaign's official  
6 website, and on campaign stationery, as if it were an authorized committee would appear to be a  
7 violation of 2 U.S.C. § 441d.

8 The amended Statement of Organization also changed the name of the principal  
9 campaign committee from one name, Concannon for Congress, to a combination of two names,  
10 "Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon for Congress," and the committee appears  
11 to be using the CFC and FAC names interchangeably. However, the use of more than one  
12 official name for the principal campaign committee does not appear to be authorized by the Act  
13 or the Commission's regulations, which only contemplate one principal campaign committee.  
14 See 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(1) and (4); 11 C.F.R. §§ 101.1 and 102.14(a).

15 Based on the above, it appears that "Friends of Andrew Concannon aka [sic] Concannon  
16 for Congress" and Raymond Mashni, in his official capacity as treasurer, violated 2 U.S.C.  
17 § 433, by untimely amending its Statement of Organization to delete FAC as an "affiliated  
18 committee" of CFC, and 2 U.S.C. § 441d, by identifying FAC, an entity not registered as an  
19 authorized committee, on its campaign communications as the entity paying for the  
20 communications.

21 These violations appear to have arisen from a misunderstanding as to the reporting and  
22 naming requirements of the Act. The Commission has no information to suggest that the  
23 communications containing the improper disclaimers, other than the website, were widely

28044220710

1 distributed or that the campaign's use of two names caused widespread confusion. Therefore, in  
2 the interest of conserving Commission resources, the Commission is exercising its prosecutorial  
3 discretion to dismiss the matter in connection with these violations, issue an admonishment, and  
4 close the file. *See Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821 (1985).

28044220711